



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,200	02/04/2004	Pamela Jones-Morton	HON 1448-049	4236
8698	7590	01/26/2009	EXAMINER	
STANLEY LAW GROUP LLP			PATS, JUSTIN	
6300 Riverside Drive			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Dublin, OH 43017			3623	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/26/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/772,200	JONES-MORTON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	JUSTIN M. PATS	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2008.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 12, 13 and 15-19 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 12, 13 and 15-19 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 December 2008 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

**DETAILED ACTION**

*Notice to Applicant*

1. The following is a Final office action. In response to Examiner's communication of 9/18/08, Applicant, on 12/18/08, amended claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19. Applicant also cancelled claims 9, 11, and 14. Finally, Applicant amended the specification and the drawings. All of these amendments have been entered. Claims 1–8, 10, 12–13, 15–19 are pending in this application and have been rejected below.

***Response to Amendment***

2. The rejection of claims 1–19 under 35 U.S.C. 101 of 9/18/08 is hereby removed in light of Applicant's amendments of 12/18/08.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1–8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Regarding claim 1, Applicant has added to the establishing a development plan step (see Applicant's Amendments to Claims, 12/18/08, pg. 6, lines 6–7) the phrase "said development plan". However, Applicant failed to add to the claim any further language regarding its development plan. As such, it is unclear what further limitation Applicant intended to insert following the phrase at issue. Therefore, for examination purposes, as currently claimed, Examiner interprets this additional phrase as not further limiting the development plan. This rejection also applies to all claims dependent upon claim 1.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1–2, 4–8, 10, 12, and 15–19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey, *The Selection of Managers for Foreign Assignments: A Planning Perspective*, The Columbia Journal of World Business, Winter 1996, pg. 102–12 in view of Mayer et al., U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0034630 [hereinafter Mayer] further in view of *China HR Manager of the Year*, China Staff, Oct 2003, Vol. 9, No. 10, pg. 23 (online reprint pg. 1–3) [hereinafter China HR].

8. As per claim 1, Harvey teaches a method for selecting associates for expatriate assignments comprising:
  - identifying a plurality of associates who may be eligible for expatriate assignments (pg. 105, Exhibit 1, Dynamic Selection Process for International Personnel, Stage 2, Cluster Candidates);
    - identifying a first set of candidates from said plurality of associates (*id.*, Pool of Potential Candidates)
    - administering a plurality of assessments to said first set of candidates (*id.*, Stage Three: Tactical Level, Selection of Candidates, Testing/Assessment);
      - entering assessment data for a first set of candidates completing said plurality of assessments and preparing candidate selection data for comparing assessment data across all candidates in said first set of candidates, including individual candidate selection worksheets/summaries (pg. 111–112, especially pg. 111, “The focus of [Stage Three] is the assessment of individual candidates to identify those who have optimum personal skills and attributes to fulfill the requirements of the position. This phase will employ selection tools developed to identify qualified candidates. Some of the tools most frequently used are detailed biographical data, standardized tests, work samples, and assessment centers.”; Exhibit 4–5. In order to assess candidates, data regarding said candidate responses or profile data must be entered in some form and prepared such that a comparison and assessment can ensue. For example, if the candidate is given an interview or standardized test, his or her answers are entered either manually on paper (likely the case in Harvey), audibly via tape recorder, or

electronically via a computer and prepared for subsequent assessment and comparison purposes.);

creating a group of candidates for said expatriate assignments by selecting a subset of candidates from said first set of candidates (pg. 113, "Once the pool of 'acceptable' candidates has been reduced, one additional dimension of the selection needs to be undertaken. Each candidate must be tested and assessed relative to additional skills that would increase the probability of success in his/her new international position. Two candidates may have equally attractive backgrounds/attributes for the assignment; but, to effectively manage in the future, what developmental activities will each candidate have to undertake before rising to another level of responsibility in the organization. The candidate who will need the least additional training might be preferred over the otherwise "equal" candidate.");

establishing a development plan for each candidate in said group of expatriate candidates (pg. 109, "More well-developed international human resource programs will have a defined succession plan for most managerial positions in the company's international operations."; *see also* pg. 105, Exhibit 1, Dynamic Selection Process for International Personnel, Stage Three: Tactical Level, Selection of Candidates, Stage of Family Life-Cycle/ Career Cycle; pg. 112, discussing the importance of the family life-cycle in evaluating potential candidates for foreign assignment in terms of at least cost and adaptation; *see also* pg. 113, "Candidates must be evaluated on their enthusiasm or the intrinsic excitement of a new position overseas; but at the same time, the longrun relocation package and career benefits offered to the candidate must also be assessed."));

identifying a specific assignment related to said expatriate assignments (pg. 105, Exhibit

1, Dynamic Selection Process for International Personnel, Stage 1, Position Requirements/Criteria); and

selecting at least one candidate from said group of expatriate candidates for said specific assignment identified from said expatriate assignments (pg. 105, Exhibit 1, Dynamic Selection Process for International Personnel, Stage Three: Tactical Level, Selection of Candidates, Selection).

Harvey does not explicitly teach providing each of said plurality of associates with preview information relevant to a plurality of expatriate assignments, said preview information comprising organization, job description, and career progression information related to said expatriate assignments, which they have reviewed prior to their identification as candidates. Nor does Harvey explicitly teach wherein a plurality of associates have agreed to be considered for said expatriate assignments prior to the receipt of information for a first set of candidates.

Mayer, in the analogous art of matching candidates to available job positions, teaches providing candidates with preview information relevant to a plurality of assignments, said preview information comprising organization and job description information related to said assignments (Mayer, ¶¶ 0065–71, 77–78), and wherein the candidates have agreed to be considered for said assignments prior to the receipt of information for a first set of candidates (Mayer, ¶ 0078, “The candidate can then indicates that he or she is interested in a particular job listing that has been provided with the search results . . . Upon selecting the listing, the employer is notified that a candidate has indicated interest in the available job and the employer receives at least a portion of the candidate profile. Preferably, identifying data corresponding to the candidate is initially withheld (step 84).”).

Harvey does not explicitly teach entering *in a computer* assessment data for said first set of candidates completing said plurality of assessments and preparing *at said computer* a summary report pertaining to candidate selection across all candidates. Meyer teaches these concepts: Potential candidates are prompted to electronically enter information so as to create an online profile which provides the employer with assessment data in order to find the best suited candidate by matching candidate profile information to the requirements of a particular position. Finally, a list can be generated of all candidate matches (Mayer, ¶ 0010, “[T]he present invention provides an interactive employment system which allows a candidate to enter profile data, including identification data, and to match their criteria and then view available job postings.”; ¶¶ 0048–52, 60, 62, discussing candidate profile preferences which a matching job profile should contain.”; ¶¶ 0081–83, “The process commences at step 90 where an employer enters job profile data for an available job opening. The data may be stored in job profile database 37. The employer may can then conduct a search for possible candidates for a job position by entering search criteria at the web site hosted by server 12 (step 91). The search criteria may incorporate some or all of the data entered above at step 90. The server then compares the entered search criteria to the candidate profiles stored in candidate profile database 36. The server next lists candidates who match the entered search criteria (step 92). All candidates with matching search terms may be listed. The list of matching candidates may be sorted according to the percentage of search terms that match each candidate.”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Harvey to include the teaching of Mayer because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did

separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Neither Harvey nor Mayer explicitly teach previewing career progression information. However, Official Notice is taken that job postings or listings comprising career progression information were old and well known in the art at the time of the invention.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Harvey in view of Meyer to include the teaching of Official Notice because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Furthermore, even though Mayer is not explicitly directed to expatriate assignments, expatriate assignments, their details, and the search for candidates to fill these positions was old and well known at the time of the invention as evidenced above by Harvey. Furthermore, even though Mayer does not explicitly teach wherein the candidates are associates, Harvey teaches this is its selection of internal associates for expatriate assignments. Because each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit in different references or embodiments, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself—that is in the substitutions of (1) expatriate assignments for the traditional job assignments of Harvey, and (2) associates for the candidates of Harvey. Thus, these instances of simple substitution of one known element for another producing a predictable result render the claim obvious.

Harvey in view of Meyer does not explicitly teach retaining information for unselected

candidates in said group of expatriate candidates for consideration in future assignments identified from said expatriate assignments. China HR, in the analogous art of employee development programs, teaches this concept (pg. 2, “Putting in place a talent management programme through identifying a pool of key talents and collaborating with China Europe International Business School (CEIBS) to customise a two-year executive management development programme with the aim to develop and retain key talents. A number of them have already moved on to higher key positions as part of succession planning and a successful case of localisation for a position previously held by an expatriate.”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Harvey in view of Mayer further in view of Official Notice to include the teaching of China HR because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

9. As per claim 2, Harvey teaches creating an assignment plan for said at least one candidate (pg. 105, Exhibit 1, Dynamic Selection Process for International Personnel, Stage One: Policy level, Corporate Goals, Position Requirements/Criteria).

10. As per claim 4 neither Harvey nor Mayer nor China HR teaches wherein providing each of said plurality of candidates with preview information regarding said expatriate assignments comprises providing each of said candidates with a realistic job preview video. However, Official Notice is taken that providing job preview videos was old and well known in the art of

job recruiting at the time of the invention. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Harvey in view of Mayer to include the teaching of Official Notice for the benefit of providing the candidate with a more realistic and accurate depiction of the prospective position and therefore increasing the chances of procuring truly interested and committed candidates who will not drop out before completion of the assignment.

11. As per claim 5, neither Harvey nor Mayer China HR explicitly teach wherein receiving identifying information for a first set of candidates from said plurality of candidates comprises determining which candidates have decided to not proceed. However, Official Notice is taken that dropout candidates and their determination was old and well known in the art at the time of the invention. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Harvey in view of Mayer to include the teaching of Official Notice for the benefit of saving an organization money by preventing the overseas assignment of an unwilling or unmotivated person.

12. As per claim 6, Harvey teaches wherein said assessments comprise motivational (pg. 105, Exhibit 1, Dynamic Selection Process for International Personnel, Stage Three: Tactical Level, Selection of Candidates, Motivational Career Path), behavioral (*id.*, Interpersonal Skills, Stage of Family Life-Cycle/Career Cycle), cultural (*id.*, Cultural Adaptability/Flexibility), and technical (*id.*, Part Performance/Technical Competence, Leadership/Decision Making Style) assessments.

13. As per claim 7, Harvey does not explicitly teach wherein establishing a development plan for each candidate in said group of expatriate candidates comprises establishing development plans according to gaps identified from said motivational, behavioral, cultural, and technical assessments. However, in stage 3 of its selection process (Exhibit 1, pg. 111–113), the method of Harvey determines these capability gaps identified from said motivational, behavioral, cultural, and technical assessments by weeding out unqualified or unable candidates that fall short of certain capabilities or characteristics. Furthermore, development plans for expatriate assignment candidates are old and well known as taught by Harvey as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1. Therefore, applying the known results of a gap analysis to a development plan would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to achieve a predictable result and result in an improved system that provides candidates with a better chance at improvement and success in the future by identifying the aspects of their capabilities that need the most improvement.

14. As per claim 8, Harvey teaches wherein at least one of said assessments is a self-assessment (pg. 112, discussing the administration of personality and psychological standardized tests to candidates to determine whether they are right for the position).

15. As per claim 10, the only difference between claim 1 and claim 10 is the reiteration of its method steps to produce additional sets of expatriate candidates and identifying and selecting candidates for *a plurality of* expatriate assignments. However, mere duplication of the parts of a method has no patentable significance unless new and unexpected result is produced. In re Harza, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960). Claim 1 is rejected above by Harvey in view of Mayer.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Harvey in view of Mayer to include these features to produce a predictable result and result in an improved system that provides for a more rigorous selection process and thus improves the chances of picking the right person for the assignment.

16. Claims 12, 15, 16, 17, and 18 recite limitations that stand rejected via the art citations and rationale applied to claims 2, 6, 8, 1, and 4 respectively as discussed above.

17. As per claim 19, Harvey in view of Mayer further in view of Official Notice further in view of China HR teaches the method of claim 10 wherein identifying a set of candidates comprises: providing each of a plurality of associates with preview information regarding a plurality of expatriate assignments (*see discussion supra ¶¶ 15, 8*); and determining which associates have reviewed said preview information and withdrawn voluntarily from further consideration (*see discussion supra ¶ 11*).

18. Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey in view of Mayer further in view of China HR, as applied to claims 1–2 above, further in view of Poe, *Selection savvy: HR should invest in the selection process for expatriate assignments to prevent costly failures down the road - Global HR - human resources*, HR Magazine, April 2002, pg. 1–4.

19. As per claim 3, neither Harvey nor Mayer nor China HR explicitly teaches completing arrangements to assign and relocate said at least one candidate for said assignment. Poe teaches this in the analogous art of expatriate selection processes (pg. 2, “In an effort to improve its success rate, Kellogg devised a pilot program intended to identify the best candidates for international assignments. The company asked managers to select possible candidates; then, HR and senior management reviewed the list and narrowed it down to 16 people. Those 16 people and their spouses were given assessment tests that looked at their work styles, values and interests. A comprehensive report on the findings was presented to the employees and their spouses, highlighting potential risks and areas of concern. To date, *four of the 16 candidates have been placed on assignment abroad*, and, Halvers on reports, "No negative issues have come up at all with these people." (emphasis added)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Harvey in view of Mayer further in view of Official Notice further in view of China HR to include the teaching of Poe because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination

were predictable.

20. Claim 13 recites limitations that stand rejected via the art citations and rationale applied to claim 3 as discussed above.

***Response to Arguments***

21. Applicant's arguments filed 12/18/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
22. Applicant argues that Harvey does not teach candidate participation in assessments prior to being selected for a candidate pool, development of a candidate pool, candidate participation in a development phase prior to the identification of specific assignments, selection of candidates from the candidate pool for specific assignments, as well as providing candidates with preview information related to a plurality of expatriate assignments. In response, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Furthermore, Mayer has been used in combination with Harvey for the concepts of prior candidate participation and providing candidates with preview information (*see* discussion *supra* ¶ 8). New reference China HR has been brought in by the Examiner to teach the candidate pool development, retention, and selection therefrom concepts (*Id.*).
23. Applicant argues that Mayer does not teach preview information for a plurality of assignments. In response, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Mayer indeed teaches this concept as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1.

24. Applicant argues that the information provided by Mayer does not regard expatriate assignments, and is not conducted prior to the individual's identification as a candidate. In response, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Harvey in view of Mayer and rationale render this limitation obvious as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1.

25. Applicant argues that neither Harvey nor Mayer teach or suggest assessing candidates to create a pool of candidates, providing development plans for the candidates, and then selecting candidates from the pool when specific assignments are identified. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are not positively recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Even so, new reference China HR fills in any gaps with respect to the disputed concepts that may arguably exist in Harvey and Mayer (*see* discussion *supra* ¶ 8).

26. Regarding claims 4, 5, and 18 Applicant has failed to rebut Examiner's Official Notice that providing job preview videos, and dropout candidates and their determination were old and well known in the art at the time of the invention. Examiner notes the following discussion of Official Notice taken from the MPEP:

To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. See 37 CFR 1.111(b). See also *Chevenard*, 139 F.2d at 713, 60 USPQ at 241 ("[I]n the absence of any demand by appellant for the examiner to produce authority for his statement, we will not consider this contention."). A general allegation

that the claims define a patentable invention without any reference to the examiner's assertion of official notice would be inadequate. If applicant adequately traverses the examiner's assertion of official notice, the examiner must provide documentary evidence in the next Office action if the rejection is to be maintained. See 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). See also *Zurko*, 258 F.3d at 1386, 59 USPQ2d at 1697 ("[T]he Board [or examiner] must point to some concrete evidence in the record in support of these findings" to satisfy the substantial evidence test). If the examiner is relying on personal knowledge to support the finding of what is known in the art, the examiner must provide an affidavit or declaration setting forth specific factual statements and explanation to support the finding. See 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2). If applicant does not traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or applicant's traverse is not adequate, the examiner should clearly indicate in the next Office action that the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or that the traverse was inadequate. If the traverse was inadequate, the examiner should include an explanation as to why it was inadequate. (MPEP § 2144.03(C))

Applicant has not "specifically point[ed] out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art." For this reason, providing job preview videos, and dropout candidates and their determination are taken to be admitted prior art.

***Conclusion***

27. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JUSTIN M. PATS whose telephone number is (571)270-1363. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Boswell can be reached on 571-272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Justin M Pats/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3623

/Andre Boyce/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623